IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.PADMANABHAN NAIR

FRIDAY, THE 22ND JUNE 2007 / 1ST ASHADHA 1929

WP(C).No. 26698 of 2006(C)

PETITIONER:

AMBIKA, W/O. LATE SRI. RADHAKRISHNAN,
RESIDING AT CHARUVILA PUTHEN VEEDU,
PERUMPUZHA, KOLLAM.

BY ADV. SRI.JOHNSON GOMEZ

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. THE STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY
THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
KOLLAM.

3. THE SPECIAL TAHSILDAR,
OFFICE OF THE SPL. TAHSILDAR (DA)NO.II,
KOLLAM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.L.G.SURESH BABU

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 22/06/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

WP(C).No. 26698 of 2006(C)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

EXT.P1: COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 13TH FEBRUARY 2001, IN L.A.A.NO.533/1998 OF THIS HON'BLE COURT.

EXT.P2: COPY OF THE LETTER NO.A1482/01 DATED 31.01.2003 ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT TO THE SECOND RESPONDENT ALONG WITH THE CALCULATION STATEMENT IN AWARD NO.8/88-89.

.....

BKN // TRUE COPY //

P.A. TO JUDGE.

K.PADMANABHAN NAIR, J.

==========

W.P.C. No. 26698 OF 2007

Dated this the 22nd day of June, 2007

==========

JUDGMENT

Some property owned by the petitioner's late husband was acquired for a public purpose. There is no demand for the enhancement. So the matter was not referred to Sub Court. But in respect of another property which was also acquired for the same purpose, an award passed by the Land Acquisition Officer. The owner of that property claimed additional compensation. The matter was returned to the Sub Court and numbered as L.A.R.347/1998. The Sub Court, Kollam passed a decree granting enhancement which was confirmed by this court in L.A.A.353/1988. The petitioner filed a petition claiming benefits under Section 28 (A). Ext.P2, produced by the petitioner shows that the 3rd respondent had prepared a calculation statement and sent it to District Collector, Kollam, for allotment of necessary funds. The grievance of the petitioner is that till date no orders are passed in the petition filed by her. Considering the fact that the petitioner is a widow and the property acquired in the year

1987, it is only just and proper that 2nd and 3rd respondents would consider her request and dispose of the same in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible at any rate within three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

The Writ Petition is disposed of in the above terms.

K.PADMANABHAN NAIR
JUDGE.

bkn